

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated September 16, 2009 (“Final Office Action”). At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-28 were pending and rejected. Applicants amend Claims 1, 7, 9, 15, 17, 24, 27, and 28. Applicants add new Claims 29-40, which are fully supported by the Application as originally filed, and which contain no new matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case in light of the remarks below.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 17, 22-23 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,922,786 issued to Ong (“*Ong*”) in view of U.S. patent No. 6,885,861 issued to Koskelainen (“*Koskelainen*”). The Office Action also rejects Claims 2-5, 10-13, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ong* in view of *Koskelainen* and further in view of Rosenberg, “Telephony Routing Over IP TRIP,” November 2000 (“*Rosenberg*”). The Office Action rejects Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ong* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,674,734 issued to Hsu et al. (“*Hsu*”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for several reasons, as explained further below.

Claims 1, 9, 17, 27

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method for tracking telecommunication services comprising:
receiving a call packet from a first node, wherein the call packet includes a call identifier identifying a call associated with the call packet;
determining a filter status of the call; and
transmitting notification messages to the first node and a second node, wherein the notification messages identify the call identifier and the filter status of the call and wherein the notification messages conform to a protocol that primarily communicates tracking information; and
forwarding the call packet to the second node.

The proposed *Ong-Koskelainen* combination fails to teach, suggest, or disclose every element of Claim 1. For example, neither *Ong* nor *Koskelainen*, alone or in combination, discloses “transmitting notification messages to the first node and a second node, wherein the notification messages identify the call identifier and the filter status of the call and wherein

the notification messages conform to a protocol that primarily communicates tracking information,” (emphasis added) as recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the proposed *Ong-Koskelainen* combination fails to teach, suggest, or disclose every element of amended Claim 1.

Amended Claim 1 is therefore allowable for at least these reasons. Although differing in scope, amended Claims 9, 17, and 27 include elements that, for reasons analogous to those discussed with respect to amended Claim 1, are not taught, suggested, or disclosed by the proposed *Ong-Koskelainen* combination. Amended Claims 9, 17, and 27, and their respective dependent claims, are therefore allowable for at least these reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of amended Claims 1, 9, 17, and 27, and their respective dependent claims.

Claims 7, 15, 24, 28

Claim 7, as amended, recites:

A method for tracking telecommunication services comprising:
receiving a request message at a first filter node from a remote node,
wherein the request message includes a call identifier;
in response to receiving the request message, determining whether the
first filter node possesses a filter status associated with the call identifier;
in response to determining that the first filter node possesses a filter
status associated with the call identifier:
determining a filter status associated with the call identifier; and
transmitting an acknowledgement message to the remote node,
wherein the acknowledgement message identifies the filter status and wherein
the acknowledgement message conforms to a protocol that primarily
communicates tracking information; and
in response to determining that the first filter node does not possess a
filter status associated with the call identifier, indicate to the remote node a
second filter node that possesses a filter status associated with the call
identifier.

The proposed *Ong-Hsu* combination fails to teach, suggest, or disclose each and every element of amended Claim 7. For example, neither *Ong* nor *Hsu*, alone or in combination, discloses “in response to determining that the first filter node does not possess a filter status associated with the call identifier, indicate to the remote node a second filter node that possesses a filter status associated with the call identifier.” Accordingly, the proposed *Ong-Hsu* combination fails to teach, suggest, or disclose every element of amended Claim 7.

Amended Claim 7 is allowable for at least these reasons. Although differing in scope, amended Claims 15, 24, and 28 include elements that, for reasons analogous to those discussed with respect to amended Claim 7, are not taught, suggested, or disclosed by the proposed *Ong-Hsu* combination. Amended Claims 7, 15, 24 and 28, and their respective dependent claims are therefore allowable for at least these reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 7, 15, 24, and 28, and their respective dependent claims.

New Claims

Applicants add new Claims 29-40, which are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. Claims 29-40 all depend from one of independent Claims 1, 9, and 17. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have all been shown above to be allowable. Additionally, Claims 29-40 recite elements not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited references. Claims 29-40 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicants respectfully request consideration and full allowance of Claims 29-40.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the \$624.00 excess claims fee and the \$810.00 Request for Continued Examination fee, and any other required fees, or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Todd A. Cason
Reg. No. 54,020

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6452

Date: December 16, 2009

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: **05073**